quired increased accommodation, which the architect had to provide."

Lord Morpeth stoutly maintained that Mr. Barry might contrast the cost, speed, and effect of his building with the cost, and speed, and effect of any other, and was sure that he would come out of that contrast without disgrace. He had wished to make it an ornament to his country, and, derivately, to his own reputation. Mr. Osborne having stated that although the Government had said the architect's remuneration should be restricted to the sum of 25,000*l.*, with the view of taking away any inducement for excessive expenditure, Mr. Barry had never fully assented, Lord Morpeth replied,—he admitted that Mr. Barry had insisted that the remuneration for his labour was below the average rate of profit in his profession. But Government had stipulated with him that his commission should not exceed 25,000*l.* upon his commencing his original design; and Mr. Barry would therefore have no reason to complain if Parliament refused to go further in the way of remuneration. He concluded by paying an eloquent compliment to Mr. Barry, to whose genius he predicted that a high place would be assigned by posterity. He believed that the architect was actuated by the single desire to make the building a credit and glory to the country, and to rivet his own reputation. He believed that the devotion of Mr. Barry's time and talents to the work had been almost unparalleled; that the anxieties to which he had been subjected had much impaired his health and spirits; and that if the confidence of the country were now withdrawn from him, he would no longer be able to maintain the contest. He owned that our national experience in matters of architecture had not been the most happy; and he did not wish to deny but that some of the items laid down in the present case, might have been intended more for the credit of the building than for the credit of the Exchequer.

Sir Robert Peel thought it unfortunate that the Treasury allowed a single stone to be laid before laying down the condition as to payment. They should have said, "We have a sum to be paid to you, be it 25,000*l.* or 30,000*l.*, or any other sum. We discourage entirely all expectation on your part of payments to a higher amount or on another principle. At all events, we give you notice that it is a matter which will be settled before the commencement of the building." "I don't think," continued the speaker, "that the blame falls on the Government, on the Woods and Forests, or the Treasury. I think the House of Commons must rather bear the blame. The House of Commons has hot and cold fits in regard to public buildings: and if the results of the deliberations of the committee of 1835 had been to present us with a building according to the *beau ideal* of excellence which has been suggested by Mr. Hume, namely, a building corresponding with Somerset House, I believe there would have been a feeling of universal disgust. There are repeated instances which I recollect when the house was in a very economical humour, and specified a sum which was not to be exceeded. First, there was Buckingham Palace. The hon. gentleman got an assurance that 300,000*l.* should be the extent of the expenditure. If he walk through St. James's park, he will now see a very significant proof of the consequence. Then there is the Treasury. After some lapse of time, it had been resolved to alter its appearance; and to whose aid are you indebted for the great improvement which has been effected? To that of the very Mr. Barry whose qualities are so much called in question. I think it is a proof of his skill that Mr. Barry has been able to make out of the Treasury, as it was left twenty or thirty years ago, so beautiful an ornament to the metropolis. There are other instances of the consequence of your economy in regard to public buildings. First you limit the architect to such an amount that his skill is fettered, and then you become so dissatisfied with the effects of your limitation of expense, that you pull down the whole front of a building and employ another architect to supply a better one. At the National Gallery again, we are all anxious that Mr. Barry should be sent to improve that. A sum perfectly inadequate was awarded to erect a building on that magnificent site, and the result is a structure on which we cannot congratulate ourselves. In the case of the National Gallery, you stinted the architect to a certain sum, and the result is, a building quite unsuited to the character of the country."

Sir Robert then proceeded to defend the appointment of the Fine Arts Commission, and justly asserted that the Commission had been in the main successful:—

"I hear it said that English taste is not accustomed to those productions which have appeared under its auspices. There are gentlemen who contemplated oil paintings as fit decorations for the Houses of Parliament; but you are to consider that the works which have been selected are novel in this country; and you find that those who are acquainted with fresco are surprised at the success which has attended the efforts of our artists. At any rate, every exertion has been made by that commission to call out the latent talent of the country; and no man can see the exhibitions of successive years in Westminster-hall without rejoicing in the opportunities which have been afforded for its development. Many, whose powers were previously unknown, and who had not had the advantage of any connection with the Royal Academy, have shown a knowledge of art for which the country was quite unprepared. In that respect the Fine Arts Commission has accomplished one of the objects originally contemplated, it having been a matter for consideration whether the erection of the new Houses of Parliament could not be rendered conducive to the promotion of art."

As to the building, he believed it to be most honourable to the country and the architect. He thought that Mr. Barry, and indeed all the artists with whom he had come into communication, are inspired with as high a feeling of honour and principle as those which animate any other class of her Majesty's subjects; and that, in general, they prefer honour and distinction to pecuniary profit. He believed that by this motive exclusively Mr. Barry had been animated; and that the result of the inquiry would show that Mr. Barry is not responsible for any excess in the expenditure, and that it would be seen to have arisen from the nature of the works, from the number of persons for whom accommodation had to be provided, from the conflicting opinions of the Lords and Commons, from the varying views of separate and joint committees, and from the immense extent of accommodation required for committees, which was hardly contemplated when the building was designed.

The *Times* of Tuesday had an excellent article on the subject, at the conclusion of which the writer says justly,—

"In such undertakings, which are unavoidably progressive in their scale, their purposes, and their decoration, it is eminently unfair to revert too rigorously to the original estimate either of time or expense. The stringent rule of using one quarry, the addition of a vast embankment to the original plan, the increased accommodation for private business, the fire-proof construction, the growing demand for internal and external decoration in every possible form, and the new and most elaborate plans of ventilation, have all created a delay, which, after all, is nothing compared with the tedious progress of other great buildings. The edifice, or rather the vast collection of edifices, ought to be regarded rather *as it is* than as it was to be. If it can be shewn to be actually excessive in any point, to be extravagant either in style or dimensions, let it be so stated; but it is evident that the Legislature was under no obligation to adhere to an insufficient or naked design. The excess on the original estimate has not, indeed, been so formidable as Mr. Osborne and his supporters would have us suppose; but, be it small or great, it is not the question. What we have to ask is, whether the building be proportioned to the wants of the Legislature, to the dignity of its purpose, and to the glory of this empire. If it does not exceed this proportion—if it does not transgress that standard of splendour which is fixed by the town and country residences of our wealthy nobility, and if it only gives the British constitution a palace and a home that can vie with the hotels de ville of the German burgher, or the gorgeous halls of despotism, then we have no reason to grudge the expense, to chide the delay, or to censure an architect who has only shewn himself equal to the occasion."

The public, we venture to affirm, do not complain of the course which is being adopted at the building in question: they know very well that to spend money in producing a noble building is a very different thing to spending it in war, to say nothing of the dim notion now growing up in the universal mind, that such works have an important influence on the national character and national happiness, and that beauty is the highest form of usefulness. Further, they do not sympathise in the impatient cry of "get on at any risk," which is heard only in the House. They desire to see the work successfully and perfectly carried out, as it undoubtedly will be if the architect be allowed fair play; and we do strongly protest against such ebullitions of personal feeling, and such unwise cavilling, as were exhibited in the House on Tuesday night, as tending most materially to obstruct this consummation. Let us have no undue waste, no unwise stint (at the same time, of course, no wasteful expenditure—no putting up of work and then knocking it down again), and we shall be able ultimately, and that before long, too, to point to a building unequalled by any contemporaneous structure in the world.

PROFESSOR COCKERELL'S LECTURES ON ARCHITECTURE.

In the fourth lecture of his course, on Thursday, the 27th ult., the professor further elucidated the principle of proportioning the parts of a Gothic church, as given in the work of Cæsarianus. He referred to the evidence, which he has explained elsewhere, of the adoption of this principle in the chapel of New College, Oxford, a work of William of Wykeham, and shewed by that building, and from Mr. Billings's clever illustrations of the panelling in Carlisle Cathedral, that the same method of forming the design upon an arrangement of squares, was carried through all the details of a structure. He then illustrated the proportions of the human figure by the diagram described by Vitruvius, attaching some importance to this portion of that author's work, which he considered had not been sufficiently appreciated by architects—as, indeed, it had been omitted altogether in some of the best known translations. Whilst in iconographic distribution, equalities prevailed, in orthographic, the principles of design discovered in the works of nature, taught us to make use of inequalities. Thus we observed that, in nature, those forms which were comparatively deficient in beauty, were those in which the parts were, in some degree, equal one to another. He shewed this by drawings, in which were contrasted the figures of the baboon and the man, and of the ass and the horse. In the baboon, the arms were nearly the same length as the legs, and the body was also of equal length; whilst, in the human form, an entirely opposite principle was evident. The head, the ears and the neck of the ass, in which also there was an approach to equality, contrasted unfavourably with the same parts in the more beautiful figure of the horse. In two faces, in one of which, the length of the nose, height of the forehead, of the upper lip, and of the chin, were equal, and, in the second, the same parts proportioned to each other as we observe them in the most beautiful counte-

For info on OCR and PDF Compression visit our website